

REMARKS

By this Amendment, Applicant cancels claim 54, and hence, claims 1-53 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 54 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

The rejection of claim 54 is moot, as claim 54 has been canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 54 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The rejection of claim 54 is moot, as claim 54 has been canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-11, 13-24, 26-29, 40-43 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Danknick (U.S. Patent 6,021,429) in view of Holloway et al. (U.S. Patent 5,905,859, hereinafter “Holloway”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 1, 13, 26, and 40

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “a device list management module which collects service information on the controlled devices connected in the network and which creates, stores and manages a list of the service information of all the controlled devices connected in the network, wherein the service information includes the operational state of each of the controlled devices.”

However, the combination of Danknick and Holloway neither teaches nor suggests such a feature. This is because neither Danknick nor Holloway, taken alone or in combination, discloses “a list of the service information of all the controlled devices connected in the network, wherein the service information includes the operational state of each of the controlled devices,” as recited in claim 1.

Rather, Danknick discloses a network device that operates as a list manager on a network. *See* Danknick, col. 2, ll. 1-4. The network device, acting as the list manager, maintains “a list of device addresses for the LAN.” *See* Danknick, col. 1, ll. 47-50, col. 9, ll. 56-57. As illustrated in Figure 8 of Danknick, the list contains an Internet Protocol (IP) address of each device, a type of device, and a manufacturer. *See* Danknick, col. 8, ll. 1-3. However, there is no teaching or suggestion that the list in Danknick is “a list of the service information...the service information [including] the operational state of each of the controlled devices.” To the extent the Examiner’s position is based on the assertion that the “status message” at column 5, lines 35 to 44 of Danknick allegedly teaches the “service information” in the list, Danknick clearly does not disclose any sort of device status or “operational state” in the list, as illustrated in Figure 8 of Danknick.

Accordingly, Danknick fails to teach or suggest the “device list management module” recited in claim 1. Holloway merely discloses a managed hub (*see* Holloway, Abstract) and also fails to teach or suggest such a feature. Therefore, even if Danknick and Holloway could have somehow been combined, as the Examiner alleges, the combination would still not teach or suggest the “device list management module” of claim 1.

In addition, claim 1 also recites, *inter alia*, “a control module which searches for service information of a specific controlled device, which has been requested by a control point, in the device list management module and which transmits the searched information to the control point.” However, the combination of Danknick and Holloway also fails to teach or suggest such a feature.

Holloway discloses a managed hub that, in response to receiving a filter set frame, sets a filter corresponding to an intruding MAC address. *See* Holloway, col. 14, lines 22-28. The filter set frame is received from interconnect devices in a network in response to a network security breach. *See* Holloway, col. 9, ll. 6-11. However, there is no teaching or suggestion that the filter set frame in Holloway is a request for “service information of a specific controlled device, which has been requested by a control point.” Rather, the filter set frame is simply a message to the managed hub that alerts the managed hub to a security breach. *See* Holloway, col. 14, ll. 11-19.

Moreover, in response to receiving the filter set frame, the managed hub sets a filter to protect the network against the breach and sends a response to the interconnect device that sent the filter set frame. *See* Holloway, col. 9, l. 11-19. However, there is no teaching or suggestion that the managed hub “transmits the searched information” of any kind to the device from which the filter set frame was received. Thus, Holloway fails to teach or suggest “a control module...which transmits the searched information to the control point.”

Accordingly, Holloway fails to teach or suggest the “control module” recited in claim 1. The Examiner concedes that Danknick fails to teach or suggest such a feature. Therefore, even if

Danknick and Holloway could have somehow been combined, as the Examiner alleges, the combination would still not teach or suggest the “control module” of claim 1.

As a result, the combination of Danknick and Holloway fails to teach or suggest all the features of claim 1, and hence claim 1 and its dependent claims would not have been rendered unpatentable by the combination of Danknick and Holloway for at least these reasons.

Independent claims 13, 26, and 40 recite features similar to those discussed above, and hence, the combination of Danknick and Holloway would not have rendered claims 13, 26, and 40, or any of the claims that depend on claim 13, 26, and 40, unpatentable for at least reasons analogous to those discussed above regarding claim 1.

Claims 12 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Danknick and Holloway as applied to claims 1, 9, 11, 13, 16, 22 and 24, in view of Tock et al. (U.S. Patent 7,146,403, hereinafter “Tock”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 12 depends on claims 1 and 11, and incorporates all the features of claims 1 and 11. Claim 25 depends on claims 13 and 24, and incorporates all the features of claims 13 and 24. Tock is cited for teaching controlling validity of a token by comparing the sums of network remaining duration times. Even if Danknick and Holloway could have somehow been modified based on Tock, as the Examiner asserts in the Office Action, the combination would still not contain all the features in claims 1 or 11, and 13 or 24, and hence claims 12 and 25, as discussed above. Accordingly, the combination of Danknick, Holloway, and Tock would not have rendered claims 12 and 25 unpatentable.

Claims 30, 32-34, 37, 38, 44, 46-48 and 50-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Danknick and Holloway as applied to claims 26, 27, 29, 40, 41, and 43, in view of Tonelli et al. (U.S. Patent 5,821,937, hereinafter “Tonelli”).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 30, 32-34, and 37-38 depend on claim 26 and incorporate all the features of claim 26. Claims 44, 46-48, and 50-52 depend on claim 40 and incorporate all the features of claim 40. Tonelli is cited for teaching transferring of the stored list of controlled devices to another controlled device. Even if Danknick and Holloway could have somehow been modified based on Tonelli, as the Examiner asserts in the Office Action, the combination would still not contain all the features of claims 26 and 40, and hence claims 30, 32-34, 37-38, 44, 46-48 and 50-52, as discussed above. Accordingly, the combination of Danknick, Holloway, and Tonelli would not have rendered claims 30, 32-34, 37-38, 44, 46-48 and 50-52 unpatentable.

Claims 31 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Danknick, Holloway and Tonelli as applied to claims 26, 27, 29, 30, 40, 41, 43, and 44 in view of Goshey et al. (U.S. Patent 6,473,783, hereinafter “Goshey”).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 31 and 45 depend on claims 26 and 40, respectively, and incorporate all the features of claims 26 and 40. Goshey is cited for teaching modification of a list. Even if Danknick, Holloway, and Tonelli could have been somehow modified based on Goshey, as the Examiner asserts in the Office Action, the combination would still not contain all the features in claims 26 and 40, and hence claims 31 and 45, as discussed above. Accordingly, the

combination of Danknick, Holloway, Tonelli, and Goshey would not have rendered claims 31 and 45 unpatentable.

Claims 35, 36, 49, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Danknick, Holloway and Tonelli as applied to claims 26, 27, 29, 30, 40, 41, 43, and 44 in view of Barilovits (U.S. Patent 7,130,582). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 35 and 36, and 49 and 50 depend on claims 26 and 40, respectively, and incorporate all the features of claims 26 and 40. Barilovits is cited for teaching the removal of a controlled device from the device list. Even if Danknick, Holloway, and Tonelli could have been somehow modified based on Barilovits, as the Examiner asserts in the Office Action, the combination would still not contain all the features in claims 26 and 40, and hence claims 35, 36, 49, and 50, as discussed above. Accordingly, the combination of Danknick, Holloway, Tonelli, and Barilovits would not have rendered claims 35, 36, 49, and 50 unpatentable.

Claims 39 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Danknick, Holloway and Tonelli as applied to claims 26, 27, 29, 30, 37, 38, 40, 41, 43, 44, 46, 51, and 52 in view of Tock. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 39 and 53 depend on claims 26 and 40, respectively, and incorporate all the features of claims 26 and 40. Even if Danknick, Holloway, and Tonelli could have been somehow modified based on Tock, as the Examiner asserts in the Office Action, the combination would still not contain all the features in claims 26 and 40, and hence claims 39 and 53, as

discussed above. Accordingly, the combination of Danknick, Holloway, Tonelli, and Tock would not have rendered claims 39 and 53 unpatentable.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Christopher J. Bezak /

Christopher J. Bezak
Registration No. 63,241

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 18, 2009